Domestic violence and violence against children in Ghana 2015

Catherine Mueller and Jean-Pierre Tranchant and Pauline Oosterhoff

Institute of Development Studies, Institute of Development Studies, Institute of Development Studies

12 August 2016

Domestic violence and violence against children in Ghana 2015

Cathérine Müller[1] Jean-Pierre Tranchant
Pauline Oosterhoff

Institute of Development Studies[2]

August 12, 2016

Abstract

This paper investigates how domestic violence relates to violence against children, including severe corporal punishment. The literature suggests a link between intimate partner violence in the household and child abuse and maltreatment. Studies are, however, limited by the use of narrowly defined measures of violence against children, data availability, and a lack of characterization of domestic violence. In this paper we use original data on domestic violence and child disciplining methods from a nationally representative household survey collected in Ghana in 2015. We conduct analyses at the individual (are people exposed to domestic violence more likely to report perpetrating violence against children?) and the household level (are children in households characterized by domestic violence more likely to be violently disciplined?). At the individual level, the data allows us to distinguish between notions of control and economic, psychological, sexual and physical domestic violence. At the household level, we use the four-way classification of intimate partner violence by Johnson (2006). Multivariate regressions show a strong and robust association between domestic violence and violence against children. Children living in households with "intimate

[1] Corresponding author; email: c.mueller@ids.ac.uk; postal address: Institute of Development Studies, Library Road, Brighton BN1 9RE, UK

[2] This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies. The authors are grateful for the helpful comments and suggestions by Dr. Katherine Brickell, Mrs. Dorcas Coker-Appiah, Dr. Akosua K. Darkwah, Dr. Nata Duvvury, Ms. Fauzia Issaka and Ms. Lynne Henderson.

terrorism" are 2.4 times more likely to be subject to severe physical punishment. Likewise, women exposed to any form of domestic violence are twice, and men exposed to physical domestic violence seven times as likely to be violent against children as other respondents. The results are discussed based on insights from secondary literature and focus group discussions across Ghana conducted by the research team.

1 Introduction

Understanding and breaking the cycle of intergenerational transmission of violence is one of the main objectives of policy makers, service providers and activists concerned with domestic violence and child abuse and maltreatment. However, research on parent-child relationships in families where domestic violence occurs is rare and mostly limited to clinical observations. Furthermore, most of the literature does not take into account different dynamics of inter-parental or other forms of domestic violence that could affect how children are treated.

Often, violence against children occurs in the form of corporal punishment - a highly controversial issue, particularly with the growing interest in children's rights (Salazar et al., 2014; Montgomery, 2008). Even though corporal punishment conflicts with international legislations and treaties such as the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and other international and regional human rights treaties, it remains widely accepted and practiced in many societies (see e.g. Cappa and Khan, 2011; Akmatov, 2010; Straus, 2010). For example, the analysis on "corporal punishment in world perspective" by Straus (2010) shows that up to 74 percent of students from 32 countries across the world remember having been spanked or hit a lot before age 12. The continuous acceptance and use of corporal punishment has its roots primarily in the view that it is part of the training children require to become responsible adults, and that it is part of the duties of parents in order to educate and raise their children (e.g. Levinson, 1981; Montgomery, 2008; Straus, 2010).

However, not all violent acts against children are carried out in order to 'discipline', and views on the usefulness of corporal punishment shift over time and across spaces, as does the fine line between acceptable and unacceptable treatment of children (Montgomery, 2008; Straus, 2010; Imoh, 2013). Several studies explore prevalence and severity of corporal punishment and investigate its drivers, including norms and attitudes towards violence in general and child corporal punishment in particular, individual characteristics of children and parents, socio-economic

characteristics of perpetrators and households children live in, and violence in the household, (see e.g. Straus, 2010; Dietz, 2000; Salazar et al., 2014; Levinson, 1981; Lansford et al., 2013).

There is also literature linking individual and household characteristics and dynamics - including intimate partner violence (IPV) - to child abuse and maltreatment (Taylor et al., 2009; Chan, 2011; Holt, Buckley and Whelan, 2008). Past research has established that children whose mothers have been assaulted by their partners are more likely to experience abuse (Jaffe et al., 2008). Corporal punishment has been shown to be an important risk factor of child maltreatment (see Gershoff, 2002, for a discussion and overview on some of this literature), which makes the distinction between child punishment and child abuse in the literature useful. However, studies on child abuse and maltreatment as well as studies aiming to measure the use of child disciplining practices, including (severe) corporal punishment, mostly build on the parent-child conflict tactics scale by Straus et al. (1998) for measuring violence against children. This blurs the distinction between the two concepts and makes it solely dependent on the severity and aim of the violent act. Indeed, as Gershoff (2002) notes, "the majority of child abuse researchers view corporal punishment and potentially abusive techniques as points on a continuum of physical acts toward children" (p. 540).

This study defines corporal punishment as the "use of physical force with the intention of causing [bodily] pain, but not injury, for purposes of correction or control of the child's behavior" (as in Straus, 2010). We define child abuse or maltreatment then as all forms of violence, be they economic, psychological, physical or sexual that are not aimed at disciplining the child, as well as severe corporal punishment that risks causing injury to children. This definition also reflects the wider understanding of violence against children by our study participants, as well as participants in other Ghanaian studies, Imoh (2013) in particular. The definition fits the second category of child abuse within the classification by Korbin (1981), as "the idiosyncratic or individual maltreatment of a child, carried out against cultural norms" (see Montgomery, 2008, p. 173 ff.).

Using original data from a nationally representative survey on domestic violence in Ghana in 2015, our analysis contributes to the literature on several levels. First, our analysis adds to the understanding of the link between domestic violence (and IPV as its most common form) and child abuse. Most studies to date have only used small or purposely selected samples; mostly of women in shelters (Jaffe et al., 2008),

and sampling bias is the most likely explanation for the large variation of estimates on the overlap of IPV and child abuse (Kelly and Johnson, 2008). Furthermore, the focus is usually on women as victims of domestic violence (mostly IPV), not taking into account that women could also be perpetrators, or that different dynamics of IPV exist that could have different impacts on how children in the household are being treated.

Second, we are able to relate different dynamics of IPV to the occurrence of methods of child disciplining, including severe corporal punishment, which we define as child abuse. The dynamics and directions of violence between spouses and partners have to be taken into account to get a better view on the perpetrators and the function of violence (Johnson, 2006; Stark, 2006; Gilfus et al., 2010; Graham-Kevan and Archer, 2003). As Kelly and Johnson (2008) note, some studies suggest that particular types of IPV (those labeled as coercive controlling violence) are related to higher risk of child abuse; yet for other types, e.g. situational couple violence, the link is still unclear.

Third, we can relate victimization of different types of domestic violence to the perpetration of violence against children, including physical, sexual, economic and psychological violence that is not explicitly aimed at disciplining children. Women and men can be victims and perpetrators of violence at the same time, and our data allow for a disaggregated analysis of women and men as perpetrators of domestic violence against children. This will help us identify which environments are particularly risky for children.

Finally, our analysis adds to the evidence base on lower and middle income countries which, with a few exceptions such as e.g. Salazar et al. (2014) and Chan (2011), are scarce.

Although the Ghanaian constitution of 1992 as well as the 2007 Domestic Violence Act (Act 732) specifically provide legislative support in favor of protecting children from all violence, the Ghana Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) 2011 shows that 94 percent of children aged 2-14 years were subject to some form of violent (physical and/or psychological) disciplinary method. Although 'only' about 50 percent of respondents believe that a child needs to be physically punished to bring them up properly, GSS (2012) reports that 14 percent of children in the age group were subjected to severe physical punishments and 73 percent to minor physical punishments. This makes Ghana one of the countries with the highest rates of violence against children in the world UNICEF (N.d.).

A better understanding of the relationship between intimate and non-intimate partner violence in the household, and violence intended to discipline the child (corporal punishment) and other violence against children, is useful for designing interventions and policies aimed at reducing violence against children. It could also facilitate attempts to coordinate efforts addressing violence against children in particular and domestic violence in general, e.g. multi-system responses (Murphy, 2010) both within Ghana and beyond.

We briefly describe the data in section 2 below, and our estimation method in section 3. Section 4 of this paper then shows the patterns of use of violence against children and choices of disciplining methods, including corporal and severe corporal punishments, and relates those to other types of domestic violence in general and IPV in particular. These findings and their implications for (policy) interventions and future research are discussed in section 5.

2 Data

2.1 Data source

The data in this analysis come from the Ghana Family Life Survey (GFLS 2015), which specifically measured different types and prevalence of domestic violence, not restricted to intimate partners. The GFLS (2015) is a nationally representative household-level survey with 4,995 respondents between 15 and 60 years of age. This survey was conducted as part of a study on domestic violence in Ghana, which also included a comprehensive literature review, 80 community level focus group discussions with women and men, and 248 key informant interviews with community leaders, members of civil society organizations, activists, legal practitioners, media representatives, health staff and officers of the domestic violence and victim support units across all ten regions in Ghana. The aim of the study - carried out for Ghana's Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection (MoGCSP) and funded by UK aid - was to provide information on incidence of domestic violence in Ghana as well as attitudes, determinants, consequences and other information that could be used to inform policies and programs aimed at reducing domestic violence.

Two quantitative questionnaires were administered through the GFLS (2015). First, a household questionnaire capturing information on all individuals "who

normally live and eat their meals together" in the household. This information includes standard socio-economic background variables such as age, sex, education levels, occupation, religion, ethnicity, etc.; as well as information on decision-making within the household, and questions about the community. Second, an individual questionnaire was administered to one man or one woman in the household, in accordance with WHO (2001) recommendations. This questionnaire contains, amongst others, five modules on experience with domestic violence both from a survivor as well as perpetrator perspective; one each for controlling behavior, sexual, physical, psychological and economic violence. It also contained questions regarding attitudes towards and practices of child punishment in the household. In order to be able to distinguish whether an act should be considered as domestic we asked whether the perpetrator and survivor shared the same roof and meals. Furthermore, we asked the respondent to identify the perpetrator by name and cross-referenced this information with the household roster. In cases where the perpetrator was identified as living outside the household, respondents were asked about their relationship to the perpetrator. Answer categories allowed for (former) partners, extended family members living within or outside the same community, non-related community members, teachers, colleagues, friends, etc. More information on the study, its methodology and a comprehensive overview of the main findings can be found in IDS, GSS and Associates (2016).

2.2 Prevalence of domestic violence and violence against children in Ghana

2.2.1 Attitudes towards child discipline and abuse

The qualitative enquiry found that the use of corporal punishment is widely practiced in Ghana, and acceptable as part of the duty of parents to educate their children. However, many respondents distinguished corporal punishment from other forms of violence that take place within the domestic sphere. Respondents expressed that children suffering from domestic violence do so mainly emotionally and physically, including being beaten because parents lack self-control and are frustrated.

When discussing violence against children, men and women of all ages in all regions highlighted parental neglect to feed, clothe and educate the children as a serious form of violence. Respondents felt this kind of neglect to be a consequence of violence that is actually directed at the mother, serving no educational purpose for the child and causing unnecessary suffering. Interviews with female survivors of

domestic violence suggest that children are used as pawns and weapons in conflicts between intimate partners during which they are exposed to interlinked physical, emotional and economic forms of violence. Asking for money for the children was often mentioned as a trigger for physical violence against the mother; and withholding money for childcare as a response to the mother by her male partner. Mothers described how their partner beat them (sometimes in front of their children), refused to pay for child support causing children to go hungry, drop out of school and losing their confidence and trust in people. Mothers felt guilty about the effects of violence on their children. Furthermore, failing to educate children as a form of punishment and risking that the child will be permanently left behind was considered as not acceptable. In a few focus groups individuals - mostly younger men - expressed their fears about girls dropping out of school due to pregnancy, but they were always challenged by the other members in these groups who argued that this was not a reason to justify refusing to pay for a girls' education. Lack of education would leave not just the child but the whole family and - according to some - even all of modern Ghana at a permanent disadvantage.

Overall, the discussions strongly suggest that child beating not aimed at correcting specific behavior of the child is not considered as 'normal' or acceptable within Ghana. But how much "correctional" violence is acceptable is not clear. Young adults who are not parents, and older grandparents highlighted the importance of intent in distinguishing between accepted and non-accepted forms of violence against children, and the importance of the effects of the violence. Imoh's (2013) study among Ghanaian children also found this distinction of intent between disciplining and abuse, and between different levels of violence - with any violence leaving permanent marks never being acceptable. It was not very clear if and where lines are drawn for verbal and psychological violence, which could also leave children emotionally and psychologically scarred.

The following quantitative enquiry investigates the extent to which the findings from the qualitative focus groups discussions are reflective of the behavior of women and men, and to what extent they could help us understand patterns of domestic violence and child abuse.

2.2.2 Domestic violence in the sample households

Table I below shows the proportion and absolute numbers (in brackets) of male and female respondents reporting domestic violence by and against intimate and non-intimate partners and relations both from the experience as a survivor and perpetrator, in the 12 months preceding the survey.

Table I: Proportion of respondents reporting victimization and perpetration of domestic violence by type of violence over the last 12 months

Type of violence	**Victimization**		**Perpetration**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Controlling behavior	9.0 % (179)	13.1 % (393)	12.7 % (252)	13.1 % (393)
Sexual violence	1.6 % (32)	2.6 % (78)	6.1 % (120)	0.9 % (26)
Physical violence	2.5 % (50)	6.4 % (192)	8.9 % (176)	8.4 % (251)
Psychological violence	9.4 % (187)	11.3 % (338)	13.6 % (269)	13.7 % (408)
Economic violence	5.8 % (115)	11.5 % (344)	3.7 % (73)	1.8 % (53)

Source: GFLS 2015; Note: The numbers relate to responses from 1,982 men and 2,989 women overall. Total numbers corresponding to the proportion in brackets.

As expected, women report higher rates of victimization for all types of domestic violence; however the share of men reporting domestic violence is non-negligible. With the exception of sexual violence against women and economic violence for both women and men, reported perpetration rates tend to be higher than victimization rates. The differences in reporting victimization and perpetration are larger for men. We believe that the large discrepancy between reported rates of victimization versus perpetration of economic violence is due to the highly subjective nature of the main form of economic violence - whether one had (been) denied chop money even though there was enough money to spend on other things. Section 7 shows how we classify all acts of controlling behavior and violence types that were elicited in the survey questionnaire. The numbers in Table I are the basis for the subsequent individual level analysis.

For the purpose of the subsequent household level analysis, we create a subset that identifies survivors and perpetrators of IPV specifically. 313 respondents reported having experienced intimate partner control either at home or by (former) partners outside the household, and 473 respondents reported having perpetrated acts of physical, psychological, sexual or economic IPV violence over the 12 months before the survey. 134 respondents both experienced and perpetrated IPV. Building on Johnson (2006), we identify four types of individual partner

violence: *Intimate terrorism* describes situations in which only one of the intimate partners is violent and controlling, but the other is neither (violence and control are one-sided). This type of IPV is also known as 'coercive controlling violence', see e.g. Kelly and Johnson (2008) and Jaffe et al. (2008). *Situational couple violence* is characterized by the fact that although at least one of the partners is violent, neither is violent *and* controlling (the violence can be one- or two-sided, but there is no dimension of control). In situations described as *violent resistance*, one of the intimate partners is violent but not controlling; and the other partner is violent *and* controlling (violence is two- but the control one-sided). Finally, in relationships with *mutual violent control*, both partners are violent and controlling (everything is two-sided). Table II below shows that the vast majority of respondents in violent intimate relationships fall into the situational violence category. As noted by Johnson (2006), this type of IPV tends to be most frequently reported type in general surveys so the result from the Ghanaian sample is in line with international evidence.

Table II: Numbers of respondents classified in each category of dyadic violence as in Johnson (2006)

Sex of respondent	Intimate terrorism	Situational violence	Violent resistance	Mutual violence
Male	52	319	13	5
Female	86	443	43	7
Total	138	762	56	12

Source: GFLS 2015; Note: These numbers do not imply any directionality; they only reflect how many women and men are in relationships described.

2.2.3 Domestic violence against children

One part of the empirical analysis investigates the role of women and men in perpetrating controlling behavior and domestic violence against children aged 14 and below in the households they live in, in the 12 months preceding the survey. Overall, 14.9 percent of respondents who live with children, report to have carried out at least one act of domestic violence against a household member 14 year olds and younger. Table III shows that women more often report having perpetrated physical acts of violence against children. If one was to assume that most of this violence is carried out in order to discipline, it would confirm findings from the qualitative analysis, which shows that although both men and women are seen as having the right as well as the obligation to discipline their children, women are

assumed to be in a better position to know what behavior needs to be corrected as they spend more time with the children. Other research has also shown that women are more likely than fathers to use corporal punishment, as they spend more time with the children (see e.g. Dietz, 2000).

Table III: Number of respondents reporting to have carried out violent acts against children aged 14 and below

	Types of domestic violence against children				
Sex of respondent	control	sexual	physical	emotional	economic
Male	9% (78)	0	2% (20)	4% (39)	1% (6)
Female	9% (205)	0	5% (116)	5% (102)	1% (22)
Total	9% (283)	0	4% (136)	5% (141)	1% (28)

Source: GFLS 2015; Note: Based on 3,051 respondents who reported having at least one child up to the age of 14 in their household. Total numbers corresponding to the proportion in brackets.

2.2.4 Disciplining methods

Two sets of questions in the questionnaire relate to (physical) punishments of children at the household level: the first one aims to elicit attitudes on child beating, and the second one asks respondents to state whether 16 forms of non-violent and violent disciplining methods, which vary in terms of severity, were used with any children up to 14 years of age in the household over the month preceding the survey. These 16 items are based on the MICS module of child disciplining and are accordingly grouped into four types of disciplining methods: (1) non-violent discipline (taking away privileges; forbidding something he/she likes; forbidding to leave the house; explain why behavior wrong; give something else to do), (2) psychological aggression (ignoring the child; shouting, yelling, screaming; calling him/her dumb, lazy etc.), (3) physical punishment (shaking child; spanking, hitting, pushing, slapping with bare hand; hit bottom or else with something; hit hand, arm or leg) and (4) severe physical punishment (hit face, head or ears; beat up as hard as possible).

As Table IV shows, psychological aggression and/or physical punishment is used as a form of disciplining in more than 60 percent of the households where at least one child aged 14 or under lives. 8.7 percent of respondents reported that severe physical

punishment methods were used in their households. These numbers are somewhat lower than those observed in late 2011, when data was collected for the MICS 2011 (GSS, 2012). This could be indicative of a downward trend of the use of violent disciplining methods in Ghana; however, due to different sampling of respondents, the MICS and GFLS data are not directly comparable. 9.3 percent of respondents in the GFLS reported the use of non-violent discipline only.

Table IV: Proportion of respondents reporting disciplining methods in the household as categorized in MICS 2011

Type of discipline	Percent	N
Non-violent discipline	60.1	3033
Psychological aggression	64.0	3033
Physical punishment	52.9	3034
Severe physical punishment	8.7	3033

Source: GFLS 2015; Note: Based on 3,051 respondents who reported having at least one child up to the age of 14 in their household.

3 Estimation Methods

The quantitative data allows us to pursue two estimation strategies: (1) an individual level analysis, and (2) a household level analysis.

The individual-level analysis directly investigates the existence of a victimization-perpetration cycle. Specifically, it aims to ascertain whether a significant correlation exists between domestic violence victimization and the perpetration of violence against children in the same household.

Past research has often found mothers to be more likely to discipline or perpetrate non-disciplining violence against children, often explained by the fact that women spend more time with their children. In order to investigate differences in the treatment of children between sexes, we run separate regressions for women and men. In addition to paying particular attention to whether the respondent experiences any type of domestic violence him- or herself, we control for individual, household and community characteristics that could explain violence against and by the respondent, as well as information on the respondents' attitudes towards gender roles and norms (using a standardized index of acceptance of wife-beating and an index of tolerance of women's sexual autonomy), and decision-making powers within the household.

We estimate the association between exposure to domestic violence and the likelihood to perpetrate violent acts against children with a logistic regression. Specifically, the model to be estimated is:

$$P[P_{ir} = 1] = \lambda[\beta_1 V_{ir} + \beta_2 X_{ir} + \mu_R + \varepsilon_{ir}] \quad (1)$$

Where $\lambda(.)$ is the logistic function, P_{ir} is the probability that individual i in region r perpetrates violent or controlling actions against children. The parameter of interest is β_1 which measures the effect of exposure to domestic violence, V_{ir}, on the probability to exert violence. X_{ir} is a vector of control variables, including e.g. occupation, education, norms or violence in the community, μ_R absorbs all region-specific effects and ε_{ir} is the error term, assumed to be i.i.d and independent of the covariates $E[\varepsilon_{ir}/V_{ir}, X_{ir}] = 0$.

Second, we investigate whether children in households where IPV takes place or where the respondent is subject to or perpetrates IPV by or against someone who does not live in the same household are more likely to experience corporal punishment, as reported by the respondent. This analysis distinguishes between different dynamics of violent and controlling behavior between intimate partners. We believe that the different dynamics of IPV could have different effects on the way children are treated within the household because several studies have shown that the different types of IPV are related to characteristics such as frequency and severity, to physical and psychological effects on the victim, and on their relationships (Leone et al., 2004; Johnson and Leone, 2005; Johnson, 2006; Kelly and Johnson, 2008). It could be that different types of IPV relate to different ways of solving disputes in general, and possibly how children are treated - with or without intent to discipline. This analysis then aims to identify which environments make children particularly vulnerable.

We estimate the association between patterns of IPV in the household and the prevalence of different disciplining methods of children as such:

$$P[VD_{hr} = 1] = \lambda[\beta_1 IPV_{hr} + \beta_2 X_{hr} + \mu_R + \varepsilon_{hr}] \quad (2)$$

Where $\lambda(.)$ is the logistic function, $P[VD_{hr} = 1]$ is the probability that certain disciplining methods are used against at least one child in the household h in region

r. The parameter of interest is β_1, which measures the effect of exposure to intimate partner violence, IPV_{hr}, on the prevalence of severe disciplining methods. X_{hr} is a vector of control variables, measured at the level of the head of household (occupation, education, marital status) or at the community level (e.g. violence in the community), μ_R absorbs all region-specific effects and E_{hr} is the error term, assumed to be i.i.d and independent of the covariates $E[E_{hr}/IPV_{hr}, X_{hr}] = 0$.

4 Results

4.1 Individual level analysis

We first show results of the estimation of equation 1 - the individual level analysis, separately for men and women. We restrict the sample to households in which children below 14 are present. Tables V and VI in section 6 show results of the analysis for violent behavior against children. Each table presents in column (1) the results of regressions where the variable of interest is the perpetration of any act of physical, sexual, emotional or economic violence against children, dependent on whether the respondent experienced any act of DV her- or himself. In columns (2 - 5) the perpetration of violence against children is made dependent on experiencing each of the 4 types of domestic violence separately. To ease the interpretation, the tables present odds ratios, i.e. the exponentiated coefficients from the logistic regressions. An odd ratio superior (inferior) to 1 associated with a given covariate indicates that the odds of perpetrating violence against children increase (decrease) when the value of the covariate goes up. An odd ratio of 1 indicates that the variable is not significantly related to the dependent variable.

Table V shows that physical violence (odds ratio of 1.75), psychological violence (odds ratio of 1.6) and economic violence (odds ratio of 1.5) against women are all statistically significantly related to higher rates of perpetration of violence against children (columns 2 - 5). Yet, the coefficient associated with *any* type of domestic violence (column 1) is both larger (odds ratio of 2.03) and much more precisely estimated ($p < 0.01$) than for each type of violence separately, suggesting that it is the exposure to any type of violence – which often means multiple forms - that is mostly related to violence against children. Furthermore, women suffering from controlling behavior are more likely to report violence against children. However, the point estimate is smaller than for domestic violence (around 1.5) and is

less precisely estimated (it is only significantly different from zero in three specifications, at a level of significance no lower than 5%).

Neither education nor social norms, witnessing domestic violence as a child or violence in the community seem to explain women's likelihood to commit violence against children. However, using the same data IDS, GSS and Associates (2016) have shown that these variables are all significantly related to the use of domestic violence against women themselves, thus having an indirect influence on violence against children.

Alcohol consumption is directly related to higher risk of violence against children (odds ratio of 1.5, $p < 0.1$). Furthermore, women who have never been in a relationship are twice as likely to perpetrate violence against children than women in a monogamous relationship or women who are divorced/ separated/ widowed ($p < 0.05$). They are even three times more likely to perpetrate violence than women in polygamous relationships ($p < 0.01$). Younger household members, mostly siblings, punishing younger children in the household, drive this result. 58 percent of never married respondents who report having perpetrated any violence against children in the home are themselves children of the household head. This is in contrast to those who are or have been married in the past: in this group, only 4 percent of those reporting violence perpetration are themselves children of the head of household. As Imoh (2013) has shown, the right to discipline younger children is 'fluid' in many Ghanaian households with older siblings punishing younger children for disobedience and bad behavior. Women living in well-off households, as measured by an assets index, are less likely to perpetrate violence against children. The magnitude of the effect is however small: a one standard deviation increase in the index reduces the likelihood of violence by 5 percent.

Table VI replicates the analysis for men. Like female respondents, men who report having suffered from any type of domestic violence are twice as likely to perpetrate violence against children than other men. This effect is not as statistically significant, however ($p < 0.1$). Looking at each type of violence separately, table VI shows that it is mostly physical domestic violence that matters for the transmission of violence. Men exposed to physical violence are almost eight times as likely to be violent against children than others, and the effect is highly significant ($p < 0.05$). Domestic violence against men is somewhat less prevalent than for women. Thus, its occurrence could be interpreted as a 'violation' of gender roles.

Frustration or redirected anger could then play a role in explaining this extreme increase in likelihood and the large difference to the coefficient in the women's regression. Also, men exposed to psychological violence are more likely to be violent against children; however both the odds ratio (2.4) and the statistical significance ($p < 0.1$) are lower than for physical violence. Unlike for women, exposure to domestic controlling behavior is never significantly related to the perpetration of violence. In fact, apart from exposure to domestic violence, none of the covariates turn out to be significant determinants of violence against children (men who take alcohol may be more likely to be violent, but this is only true for one specification).

In sum - and with the caveat that we only measure correlations - tables V-VI strongly suggest that violence could be transmitted through generations, while controlling for a wide range of confounding factors. Women and men who are exposed to domestic violence are about twice as likely to report perpetrating domestic violence against children (with a very strong impact of physical violence against men). Repeating the analysis for each type of violence (physical, psychological, economic and controlling behavior) against children separately, shows that women who experienced domestic violence tend to perpetrate physical and psychological violence against children. Women experiencing controlling behavior only are more likely to perpetrate physical violence against children only (results not shown, but available upon request).

4.2 Household level analysis

We now turn to the household-level analysis of the relationships between patterns of IPV and patterns of child disciplining. As seen in the individual level analyses of women and men above, taking patterns and dynamics of violence in the household into account seems important in order to better understand which children are at particular risk of violence. As we cannot distinguish which parent or non-parent carries out the disciplining of children, we measure IPV at the household level (the direction of the IPV does not matter).

Table VII presents the results of the estimation of equation (2). There is a large and statistically significant association between IPV and the use of violent child disciplining methods, mirroring findings from other studies, such

as Salazar et al. (2014), where all types of IPV were associated with higher risks of corporal child punishment.

More specifically, children in households characterized by "intimate terrorism", i.e. in which one of the partners is violent and controlling, are 2.4 times more likely to be subject to severe ($p < 0.05$) and 1.6 times more likely to be subject to non-severe physical punishments ($p < 0.1$) than children in households free of IPV. Likewise, children living in households characterized by "situational violence", in which violence can be one- or two-sided but control is absent, are 1.9 times more likely to be subject to severe ($p < 0.01$) and 30 percent more likely to be subject to psychological punishment ($p < 0.05$) than children in IPV-free households. The association between IPV and violent child disciplining is strongest when the former takes the form of "violent resistance", i.e. when violence is two-sided but control is one-sided. Children in households where violent resistance occurs are 3.7 times more likely to be exposed to severe physical punishment ($p < 0.01$) and 2.8 times more likely to be exposed to psychological punishment ($p < .05$) than children living in households without IPV.

Given the dynamics of control and violence within the categorizations of IPV, these results are not surprising. For example, Straus (2010) reports that children in households with higher levels of intra-parental violence were more likely to experience corporal punishment. Kelly and Johnson (2008) suspect that children in households with coercive controlling violence (intimate terrorism) are more likely to experience "severe and extensive adjustment problems" (p. 490) than those in families with situational couple violence. However, we observe the highest risk for children in households where the controlled partner 'fights back' (violent resistance). This emphasizes the need to understand the intra-household dynamics of violence in the interest of children's safety and well-being.

The lack of consistent significant effects of IPV dynamics on non-severe physical child punishment (column 2) seems to confirm that physical punishment is indeed accepted and used widely across the households with and without IPV. This notion is also confirmed by the fact that household characteristics such as asset (wealth) index, education level of the household head, and whether the household lives in a rural or urban area are not significant predictors of the use of discipline either. To the extent that experiencing violence as a child leads to greater tolerance and use of

violence as an adult - in the form of IPV, anti-social behavior, crime and others (see Holt, Buckley and Whelan, 2008, for an overview on this literature), the acceptance of physical punishment against children forms part of the intergenerational cycle of violence.

The age of the head of household exerts a small negative effect on likelihood of physical punishment and a small positive effect on the likelihood of psychological violence. Also consistent with findings of other studies is the fact that violence in the community is consistently and significantly linked with higher rates of violent disciplining (see Winstok and Straus, 2011, for similar results); and that the number of children is positively and significantly associated with all violent disciplining methods (see e.g. Dietz, 2000; Straus, 2010): one additional child increases the odds of violent punishment methods by 13 to 28 percent and reduces the odds of non-violent disciplining by 20 percent. Finally, there is a substantial deal of regional variability. Even after controlling for the host of factors present in table VII, regional variables are always jointly significant at the 1 percent level.

5 Discussion

Five major results stand out from the analyses presented above:

1) Child beating not aimed at correcting specific behavior of the child is not considered as 'normal' or acceptable in Ghana. A clear distinction is made between corporal punishment - still widely practiced across the socio-economic spectrum and acceptable as part of parents' duty to educate their children - from other forms of violence that take place within the domestic sphere. As in other studies, the *intent* of the punisher and *level/severity* of the punishment distinguishes it from abuse.

2) Nevertheless, of all the respondents reporting to have perpetrated violence in their home during the 12 months preceding the survey, 47 percent reported physical, 23 percent physical and psychological, and 5 percent economic violence directed against children aged 14 and younger in the household. Furthermore, more than 60 percent of the households with children up to the age 14 use psychological aggression and/or physical punishment as a form of disciplining, and 8.7 percent of respondents report using severe physical punishment methods. The use of harsher, potentially injuring, disciplining methods is highly correlated with the use of violence against children not aimed at disciplining. These observations seem to confirm suggestions

that exposure to/experience of corporal punishment could be an important risk factor of child abuse, and that both are points on a continuum of (physical) acts towards children.

(3) Women and men can be both perpetrators as well as victims of violence. Experiencing domestic violence increases the likelihood of the use of violence against children, by both women and men. However, there are differential effects of violence against women and men and how they could in turn affect the perpetration of violence against children. For women, it is the exposure to multiple forms of violence in particular, and for men it is foremost physical and psychological domestic violence that appears as risk factors for children. Neither education, nor social norms and attitudes as expressed by the respondent, or exposure to domestic violence in childhood contribute to explain risk patterns for children. However, the latter factors are important predictors of exposure to domestic violence, which shows part of an inter-generational transmission of violence. We cannot test the reason why men and women experiencing domestic violence perpetrate violence against children, i.e. whether they want their children to 'behave' in order to protect them from violence by a third party (see e.g. Margolin et al., 2003), whether perpetration of violence against a child results in the partner punishing the aggressor, or whether they transfer their frustration and aggression that they cannot direct against their aggressor towards children ('spillover hypothesis', see e.g. Lansford et al., 2013). However, we tested whether different dynamics of intra-partner violence would be correlated with higher risks of perpetration of violence in the form of severe corporal punishment of children (see next point).

(4) Violence between intimate partners increases the risk of more dangerous forms of child disciplining methods: severe physical punishments. The more the violence between intimate partners is a constant factor where one of the partners tries to control the other, and the more both partners are involved in violent acts against each other, the higher the risk for children. This suggests that distinguishing between different types and dynamics of IPV is an important factor in predicting the risk of violence against children and in designing tailored responses and preventive interventions that protect children and try to break the cycle of intra-familial violence. It also adds a piece of information to the consequences of the most frequent forms of IPV.

(5) Finally, we found that community level violence plays an important role in determining the risk of physical and severe physical punishments of children. This could suggest two things, which might be a subject for future research. First, parents could indeed be worried about their children's behavior and safety, and thus resort to stricter disciplining methods (see the discussion by Winstok and Straus, 2011, on 'normative and functional aspects of parental aggression', p. 691). Second, it could be that members of violent communities are more accepting of violence as a conflict resolving method. Levinson (1989) (in Montgomery, 2008) found that societies where corporal punishment was more common, also had higher levels of other types of violence, such as wife abuse and sibling aggression.

An understanding of the dynamics above is crucial in designing effective interventions and policies aimed at reducing violence against children. The evidence presented is based on a representative sample of households, and suggests that efforts coordinating a response to violence against children and domestic violence at the same time, e.g. multi-system responses (Murphy, 2010), could be highly effective. A monitoring system where providers of health and education services screen consistently for signs of domestic violence in general and violence against the child in particular seems to be most appropriate for children's as well as parents' well-being. IPV screening in clinical settings combined with interventions has been shown to be an entry point into effective interventions for prevention of violence against children (Hillis et al., 2015). Furthermore, differentiating between different types of IPV could prove very useful to determine risks in custody cases and deciding "whether parent-child contact is appropriate, what safeguards are necessary, and what type of parenting plans are likely to promote healthy outcomes for children and parent-child relationships" (Jaffe et al., 2008), as violent resistance, intimate terrorism and situational couple violence are strongly linked to the risk of child abuse. However, these types of IPV are inherently different and thus can be dealt with differently. For example, it is not unreasonable to assume that couples with situational violence could undergo mediation and counseling teaching them how to deal with conflicts in non-violent ways more willingly, successfully and with less danger to everyone involved than partners where one exerts coercive controlling violence against the other. Cases with a history of (severe) physical or psychological assaults most likely call for alternatives to mediation, particularly when screening raises concerns about one partners' and/or the children's safety (Kelly and Johnson, 2008).

Awareness raising and interventions aimed at changing norms and attitudes towards child disciplining methods could also be useful. Where some children interpret physical punishments as "expression of love and a sign of care by parents and caregivers" (Imoh, 2013, p. 479), there is a danger of children internalizing and learning that violence can be a positive and valuable thing, and transmit norms and attitudes that reinforce the persistence of domestic violence across generations. Indeed, examples of that have been shared in Imoh (2013), who reports "children often punish younger children very often for the same misdemeanors that adults feel require physical punishment - not undertaking duties, disobedience and misbehavior" (p. 483).

Hillis et al. (2015) identify strategies that have shown to help to prevent violence against children. Based on evidence from high, middle and low-income countries, strategies that have been proven effective include training in parenting in the home as well as communities and as part of more comprehensive programs. Home visitation programs reduce maltreatment of infants and toddlers in the US and South Africa; parenting programs that include positive social-emotional skills components or aim to prevent violence by peers or partners; and small group parenting trainings have improved children's cognitive development; reduced violent behaviors, bullying and dating abuse victimization; and reduced harsh disciplining and abusive or neglectful parenting. But challenging social norms that allow or accept violence against children can and should also target non-parents, and has proven to be quite promising. Small group programs in India and South Africa, for example, have resulted in a reduction of IPV perpetration of men; and bystander, community mobilization programs and campaigns have been shown to decrease victimization and acceptance of violence, and to increase awareness about programs that prevent or support survivors of violence (*ibid*).

6 Tables

Table V: Exposure to domestic violence among women and perpetration of violence against children

Dependent variable: Perpetration of violence against children over the last 12 months					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Exposed to domestic control	1.27	1.40	1.55**	1.42*	1.47*
	(0.28)	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.30)	(0.32)
Exposed to any domestic violence	2.03***				
	(0.41)				
Exposed to physical DV		1.75*			
		(0.53)			
Exposed to sexual DV			1.83		
			(0.94)		
Exposed to psychological DV				1.61**	
				(0.35)	
Exposed to economic DV					1.51*
					(0.37)
Age	1.01*	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01
	(0.0082)	(0.0083)	(0.0083)	(0.0081)	(0.0082)
Work status, r: self-employed					
Employed	1.17	1.15	1.17	1.17	1.17
	(0.32)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.31)	(0.32)
Not working	0.79	0.80	0.80	0.81	0.80
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Assets Index	0.95**	0.95**	0.94**	0.95**	0.95**
	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.023)
Marital status, r: never been in a relationship					
In a monogamous relationship	0.51*	0.51**	0.50**	0.53*	0.48**
	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.16)
In a polygamous relationship	0.34***	0.35***	0.35***	0.37**	0.33***
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.13)

Continued on next page

Divorced/separated/widowed	0.49*	0.48*	0.47*	0.49*	0.47**
	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.18)

Continued on next page

– Continued from last page

School level, r: no education					
Primary	0.89	0.92	0.95	0.93	0.94
	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.23)
Middle	0.94	0.96	0.97	0.96	0.95
	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Secondary	0.68	0.69	0.70	0.70	0.69
	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.24)
Technical	0.30	0.30	0.31	0.30	0.30
	(0.30)	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.30)
Higher	1.24	1.25	1.28	1.26	1.27
	(0.51)	(0.50)	(0.51)	(0.50)	(0.51)
Residence	0.94	0.97	0.97	0.96	0.96
	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)
Patriarchal gender norms	0.88	0.88	0.89	0.88	0.88
	(0.082)	(0.082)	(0.081)	(0.081)	(0.082)
Tolerance to wife beating	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01	1.00
	(0.078)	(0.076)	(0.077)	(0.078)	(0.077)
Tolerance to women sexual autonomy	1.00	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.01
	(0.088)	(0.087)	(0.087)	(0.088)	(0.087)
Decision-making power within household	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05
	(0.094)	(0.093)	(0.094)	(0.094)	(0.093)
notokbeatchild2	1.37	1.34	1.35	1.34	1.35
	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.27)	(0.26)	(0.26)
Respondent takes alcohol	1.49*	1.48*	1.51*	1.52*	1.49*
	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.33)
Witnessed domestic violence as a child	1.16	1.24	1.22	1.21	1.20
	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)
Violence in community	0.81	0.84	0.82	0.83	0.83
	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)
Observations	2161	2161	2161	2161	2161
r2					

Exponentiated coefficients; Standard errors in parentheses. All regressions include regional dummies.

Continued on next page

– Continued from last page

*p < 0.1, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01

Table VI: Exposure to domestic violence among men and perpetration of violence against children

Dependent variable: Perpetration of violence against children over the last 12 months

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Exposed to domestic control	1.43	1.60	1.45	1.53
	(0.77)	(0.80)	(0.77)	(0.80)
Exposed to any domestic violence	2.18*			
	(0.92)			
Exposed to physical DV		7.83**		
		(7.18)		
Exposed to psychological DV			2.36*	
			(1.07)	
Exposed to economic DV				1.42
				(0.95)
Age	1.03	1.02	1.03	1.02
	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.017)
Work status, r: self-employed				
Employed	1.25	1.18	1.32	1.22
	(0.54)	(0.51)	(0.56)	(0.53)
Not working	1.95	1.91	2.05	1.95
	(1.22)	(1.24)	(1.23)	(1.22)
Assets Index	0.97	0.97	0.96	0.96
	(0.065)	(0.066)	(0.068)	(0.065)
Marital status, r: never been in a relationship				
In a monogamous relationship	0.99	1.20	0.98	1.03
	(0.51)	(0.65)	(0.49)	(0.53)
In a polygamous relationship	1.41	1.71	1.38	1.48
	(0.90)	(1.11)	(0.87)	(0.94)
Divorced/separated/widowed	0.51	0.56	0.54	0.52

Continued on next page

– *Continued from last page*

(0.50)	(0.55)	(0.52)	(0.52)

Continued on next page

– Continued from last page

School level, r: no education				
Primary	1.14	1.10	1.18	1.15
	(0.48)	(0.47)	(0.50)	(0.48)
Middle	0.76	0.78	0.81	0.79
	(0.30)	(0.31)	(0.32)	(0.31)
Secondary	1.16	1.23	1.22	1.25
	(0.61)	(0.66)	(0.64)	(0.64)
Technical	0.76	0.80	0.78	0.77
	(0.77)	(0.80)	(0.78)	(0.78)
Higher	1.02	1.04	0.99	0.99
	(0.65)	(0.67)	(0.63)	(0.64)
Residence	1.17	1.16	1.13	1.15
	(0.55)	(0.58)	(0.53)	(0.55)
Patriarchal gender norms	0.77	0.76	0.79	0.78
	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.13)
Tolerance to wife beating	0.95	0.99	0.95	0.98
	(0.18)	(0.19)	(0.18)	(0.19)
Tolerance to women sexual autonomy	1.12	1.17	1.12	1.14
	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)
Decision-making power within household	0.96	0.89	0.95	0.93
	(0.25)	(0.23)	(0.25)	(0.24)
notokbeatchild2	0.99	1.02	1.01	0.99
	(0.37)	(0.39)	(0.37)	(0.37)
Respondent takes alcohol	1.74	1.79*	1.72	1.74
	(0.61)	(0.64)	(0.60)	(0.61)
Witnessed domestic violence as a child	1.54	1.60	1.59	1.67
	(0.56)	(0.57)	(0.57)	(0.59)
Violence in the community	0.77	0.84	0.79	0.86
	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.26)
Observations	758	758	758	758
r2				

Exponentiated coefficients; Standard errors in parentheses. All regressions include regional dummies.

Continued on next page

– *Continued from last page*

*$p < 0.1$, **$p < 0.05$, ***$p < 0.01$

Table VII: Intimate Partner Violence in the Household and Child Disciplining Methods

Dependent variable:	Severe Physical Punishment (1)	Physical Punishment (2)	Psychological Punishment (3)	Non-Violent Disciplining (4)
Intimate Terrorism	2.39**	1.55*	1.18	0.63
	(0.82)	(0.37)	(0.31)	(0.19)
Situational Violence	1.86***	1.13	1.29**	0.87
	(0.33)	(0.11)	(0.16)	(0.11)
Violent Resistance	3.67***	1.62	2.79**	0.50
	(1.83)	(0.63)	(1.41)	(0.28)
Age household head	1.00	0.99***	1.01*	0.99*
	(0.0054)	(0.0034)	(0.0033)	(0.0037)
Sex household head	0.79	1.21*	1.12	0.82
	(0.15)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.11)
Number of children	1.13***	1.28***	1.19***	0.79***
	(0.055)	(0.045)	(0.044)	(0.033)
Work status of head of household, r: self-employed				
Employed	0.67	0.97	1.02	0.93
	(0.17)	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Not working	1.23	0.81	0.85	1.34**
	(0.29)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.20)
Assets Index	0.99	0.98	0.97**	1.02
	(0.026)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.017)
Marital status of head of household, r: never been in a relationship				
Married or living with someone	1.55	1.19	1.28	0.82
	(0.55)	(0.20)	(0.22)	(0.16)

Continued on next page

– *Continued from last page*

Divorced/ Separated/ Widowed	1.59	1.05	1.27	0.77
	(0.63)	(0.19)	(0.24)	(0.15)
School level of head of household, r: no education				
Primary	0.94	1.01	1.09	0.90
	(0.20)	(0.14)	(0.17)	(0.15)
Middle	1.03	0.97	1.11	0.90
	(0.22)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.12)
Secondary	0.93	1.03	0.96	0.94
	(0.25)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.17)
Technical	0.78	0.96	0.97	1.09
	(0.52)	(0.25)	(0.29)	(0.31)
Higher	0.64	0.83	0.89	1.19
	(0.26)	(0.16)	(0.18)	(0.27)
Residence	0.89	0.87	0.99	0.98
	(0.20)	(0.091)	(0.10)	(0.12)
Violence in community	1.23***	1.17***	1.15***	0.85***
	(0.082)	(0.049)	(0.056)	(0.046)
Observations	2950	2951	2950	2968
r2				

Exponentiated coefficients. Standard errors in parentheses. All regressions include regional dummies.
*$p < 0.1$, **$p < 0.05$, ***$p < 0.01$

7 Classification of violent and controlling acts

1. Controlling behavior

   - Kept you from seeing your friends or family of birth
   - Stopped you from leaving your house?
   - Insisted on knowing where you are at all times including by controlling/checking your phones/texts/emails?

- Stalked you including by calling, messaging, watching or following you to a point where you felt uncomfortable?
- Threatened to abandon you, ignored you or treated you indifferently
- Done things to scare or intimidate you on purpose? (For example by breaking things in front of you)
- Threatened to use a gun, knife or other weapon against you?
- Threatened to hurt you or you care about with something other than a weapon? This includes threats to take away children or someone you care about.
- Forced you to have an abortion?
- Controlled your own belongings and/or your spending decisions?
- Prohibited you from working or forced you to quit your work?
- Forced you to work against your will?

2. Sexual violence

- Made inappropriate sexual comments to you that made you feel uncomfortable?
- Touched you in an inappropriate and sexual way that made you feel uncomfortable
- Physically forced you to have sexual intercourse or perform a sexual act when you did not want to?
- Otherwise forced you to have sexual intercourse or perform a sexual act when you did not want to? This could be by blackmailing, threatening or scaring you.
- Had sexual intercourse or other sexual act without you being able to give your permission?
- Not used protection even after you asked?
- A sexual partner did not reveal to you that he/she had HIV (and they knew about it)?
- Had sexual intercourse or performed a sexual act with someone because you felt like you did not have a choice or you were worried about the reaction?

- Penetrated you with an object against your will?

3. Physical violence

- Slapped you or thrown something at you that could hurt you?
- Pushed you or shoved you?
- Hit you with his/her fist or with something else that could hurt you? -
- Kicked you, dragged you or beaten you up?
- Choked or strangled you on purpose?
- Burnt you on purpose?
- Used a gun, knife or other weapon against you?
- Poured hazardous chemicals or substances (e.g. acid) on you?
- FOR MEN ONLY: Kicked or pulled your external genitalia?

4. Emotional violence

- Insulted, belittled, or humiliated you in private or in front of other people
- Spread false information about you and/or distributed photos or videos of you without your permission?

5. Economic violence

- Refused to give you enough chop money even though you think he/she has enough money to spend on other things?
- Taken cash or withdrawn money from your bank account or other savings without permission?
- Destroyed or damaged property that you have material interest in?
- Refused to give you or denied you food or other basic needs?

References

Akmatov, Manas K. 2010. "Child abuse in 28 developing and transitional countries—results from the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys." *International Journal of Epidemiology* pp. 1–9.

Appel, Anne E and George W Holden. 1998. "The co-occurrence of spouse and physical child abuse: A review and appraisal." *Journal of Family Psychology* 12(4):578–599.

Cappa, Claudia and Shane M Khan. 2011. "Understanding caregivers' attitudes towards physical punishment of children: evidence from 34 low-and middle-income countries." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 35(12):1009–1021.

Chan, Ko Ling. 2011. "Children exposed to child maltreatment and intimate partner violence: A study of co-occurrence among Hong Kong Chinese families." *Child abuse & neglect* 35(7):532–542.

Dietz, Tracy L. 2000. "Disciplining children: characteristics associated with the use of corporal punishment." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 24(12):1529–1542.

Gershoff, Elizabeth Thompson. 2002. "Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviors and experiences: a meta-analytic and theoretical review." *Psychological Bulletin* 128(4):539.

Gilfus, Mary E., Nicole Trabold, Patricia O'Brien and Ann Fleck-Henderson. 2010. "Gender and Intimate Partner Violence: Evaluating the Evidence." *Journal of Social Work Education* 46(2):245–263.

Graham-Kevan, Nicola and John Archer. 2003. "Intimate Terrorism and Common Couple Violence A Test of Johnson's Predictions in Four British Samples." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18(11):1247–1270.

GSS. 2012. Ghana Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey with an Enhanced Malaria Module and Biomarker 2011. Final report Ghana Statistical Service.

Hillis, SD, JA Mercy, J Saul, J Gleckel, N Abad and H Kress. 2015. "THRIVES: A global technical package to prevent violence against children." *Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention* .

Holt, Stephanie, Helen Buckley and Sadhbh Whelan. 2008. "The impact of exposure to domestic violence on children and young people: a review of the literature." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 32(8):797–810.

IDS, GSS and Associates. 2016. "Domestic Violence in Ghana: Incidence, Attitudes, Determinants and Consequences." Project Report, Brighton: IDS.

Imoh, Afua Twum-Danso. 2013. "Children's perceptions of physical punishment in Ghana and the implications for children's rights." *Childhood* 20(4):472–486.

Jaffe, Peter G, Janet R Johnston, Claire V Crooks and Nicholas Bala. 2008. "Custody disputes involving allegations of domestic violence: Toward a differentiated approach to parenting plans." *Family Court Review* 46(3):500–522.

Johnson, Michael P. 2006. "Conflict and control: gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence." *Violence Against Women* 12(11):1003–1018.

Johnson, Michael P and Janel M Leone. 2005. "The differential effects of intimate terrorism and situational couple violence findings from the national violence against women survey." *Journal of family issues* 26(3):322–349.

Johnson, Michael P. and Kathleen J. Ferraro. 2000. "Research on Domestic Violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(4):948–963.

Kelly, Joan B and Michael P Johnson. 2008. "Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: Research update and implications for interventions." *Family Court Review* 46(3):476–499.

Lansford, Jennifer E, Angela D Staples, John E Bates, Gregory S Pettit and Kenneth A Dodge. 2013. "Trajectories of Mothers' Discipline Strategies and Interparental Conflict: Interrelated Change during Middle Childhood." *Journal of Family Communication* 13(3):178–195.

Leone, Janel M, Michael P Johnson, Catherine L Cohan and Susan E Lloyd. 2004. "Consequences of Male Partner Violence for Low-Income Minority Women." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(2):472–490.

Levinson, David. 1981. "Physical punishment of children and wifebeating in cross-cultural perspective." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 5(2):193–195.

Margolin, Gayla, Elana B Gordis, Anna Marie Medina and Pamella H Oliver. 2003. "The co-occurrence of husband-to-wife aggression, family-of-origin aggression, and child abuse potential in a community sample implications for parenting." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18(4):413–440.

Montgomery, Heather. 2008. *An introduction to childhood: Anthropological perspectives on children's lives*. John Wiley & Sons.

Murphy, Robert A. 2010. "Multi-system responses in the context of child maltreatment and intimate partner violence." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 34(8):555–557.

Salazar, Mariano, Kjerstin Dahlblom, Lucia Solórzano and Andrés Herrera. 2014. "Exposure to intimate partner violence reduces the protective effect that women's high education has on children's corporal punishment: A population-based study." *Global Health Action* 7.

Stark, Evan. 2006. "Commentary on Johnson's "Conflict and Control: Gender Symmetry and Asymmetry in Domestic Violence"." *Violence Against Women* 12(11):1019–1025.

Straus, Murray A. 2010. "Prevalence, societal causes, and trends in corporal punishment by parents in world perspective." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 73(2):1–30.

Straus, Murray A, Sherry L Hamby, David Finkelhor, David W Moore and Desmond Runyan. 1998. "Identification of child maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales: Development and psychometric data for a national sample of American parents." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 22(4):249–270.

Taylor, Catherine A, Neil B Guterman, Shawna J Lee and Paul J Rathouz. 2009. "Intimate partner violence, maternal stress, nativity, and risk for maternal maltreatment of young children." *American Journal of Public Health* 99(1):175–183.

UNICEF. N.d. UNICEF Annual Report 2013 – Ghana. Technical report UNICEF http://www.unicef.org/about/annualreport/files/Ghana_COAR_2013.pdf: .

WHO. 2001. "Putting women first: Ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women.".

Winstok, Zeev and Murray A Straus. 2011. "Perceived neighborhood violence and use of verbal aggression, corporal punishment, and physical abuse by a national sample of parents in Israel." *Journal of Community Psychology* 39(6):678–697.